

## REMARKS

The last Office Action of November 21, 2002 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-38 are pending in the application. Claims 3-5, 7, 8, 11, 14, 18-21, 24, 27, and 38 have been withdrawn from consideration. No claims have been amended, canceled or added.

Claims 1-2, 6, 9-10, 12-13, 15-17, 22-23, 25-26, 28-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,777,420 (hereinafter "Gamble et al.").

Claims 1-2, 6, 9-10, 12-13, 15-17, 22-23, 25-26, 28-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,893,205 (hereinafter "McClelland").

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully traversed.

The present invention, as set forth in independent claims 1, 16 and 33, is substantially directed to a rotor which includes a web structure to realize an inertial mass relief. As noted in paragraph {0009} of the instant specification, the present invention resolves prior art shortcomings, relating to increase in moment of inertia, by providing an inertial mass relief through arrangement of a web structure, i.e. a structure with a plurality of relief zones.

The Gamble et al. reference is directed to a high temperature superconductor. The rejection by the Examiner is based on the illustration of Fig. 7

in Gamble et al., where a plot showing the magnetic field distribution within the rotor is illustrated to demonstrate the increased flux flowing through the iron core (50). More specifically, the Examiner equates the indication of two cross arrangements in 45° offset relationship as secant-like webs structure as set forth in claims 1, 16 and 33. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather than representing a tangible or concrete web structure, the indicated cross arrangements merely constitute the provision of air gaps. This is evidenced two-fold. Firstly, one of the cross arrangements has a thickness that is reduced to zero in the direction of the center. Clearly, this is not possible if a tangible or material structure is involved. Secondly, the lines representing the cross arrangements are open to the outside and infinite. Also this is a clear indication that no tangible structure is involved here but merely an air gap.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that Gamble et al. neither teaches nor suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claims 1, 16 and 33.

The McClelland reference relates to a reluctance motor which is formed with flux barriers (140) between central flux guides (135). As set forth in col. 6, lines 7 to 10, “[O]nce the rotor has been assembled, it is potted by introducing a settable substance 230 into the spaces of the flux barriers [ ]”. In col. 7, lines 7 to 10, it is noted that “[T]he bars of resin running axially along the rotor in spaces (140) and (160) act as retaining members **increasing** the mechanical rigidity of the assembled rotor”. [emphasis added]. These flux guides and flux barriers thus are provided for flux conduction and are not intended for a **reduction** of the inertia

of the rotor. In fact, McClelland teaches away from the subject matter of the present invention, when proposing to fill the flux barriers by a filling material, i.e. material that is neither magnetic nor electrically conductive, so that the inertia of the rotor is increased.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that McClelland neither teaches nor suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claims 1, 16 and 33.

As for the rejection of the dependent claims, these claims depend on claims 1, 16 and 33, share their presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 6, 9-10, 12-13, 15-17, 22-23, 25-26, 28-37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is thus respectfully requested.

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the newly submitted claims. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

Applicant believes that when the Examiner reconsiders the claims in the light of the above comments, he will agree that the invention is in no way properly met or anticipated or even suggested by any of the references however they are considered.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Henry M. Feiereisen  
Agent For Applicant  
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: February 20, 2003  
350 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 3220  
New York, N.Y. 10118  
(212)244-5500  
HMF:af